



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/824,298	04/02/2001	Jeffrey Douglas Haggar	RSW920010036US1	9384

7590 02/16/2005

Jerry W. Herndon
IBM Corporation T81/503
PO Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

MATTIS, JASON E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2665

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/824,298

Applicant(s)

HAGGAR ET AL.

Examiner

Jason E Mattis

Art Unit

2665

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 11, 33, and 45 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Each of these claims contains the limitation, "changing a type of server for data packets for the selected path". It appears that the word "server" is a typo and should have been "service". There is no mention in the description describing changing a type of server; however, there are multiple mentions of changing a type of service of a packet (for example see lines 3-12 and Figure 6 of the description). It is recommended that "server" be changed to "service" in these claims. For the purposes of examination these claims will be treated as if they read "changing a type of service for data packets for the selected path".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2665

3. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-12, 23-27, 29-31, 33-39, 41-43, and 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jain et al. (U.S. Pat. 5491801).

With respect to claims 1, 23, and 35, Jain et al. discloses a method, data processing system, and computer program product for managing traffic in a network data processing system **(See the abstract of Jain et al. for reference to a method and apparatus for operating a digital communication network to avoid congestion)**. Jain et al. also discloses monitoring traffic for a plurality of network paths **(See column 9 lines 44-55 of Jain et al. for reference to monitoring the throughput associated with each source/destination pair sending packets)**. Jain et al. further discloses responsive to a packet for a particular network path within the plurality of network paths causing traffic for the particular network path to exceed a level of traffic allowed, reducing an amount of bandwidth available based on a fair share for the particular network path **(See column 10 line 22 to column 11 line 39 of Jain et al. for reference to identifying S-D route pairs with throughputs which are larger than the fair share and decreasing the bandwidth available to the violating S-D route pairs by decreasing a window size)**.

With respect to claims 7, 29, and 41, Jain et al. discloses a method, data processing system, and computer program product for managing traffic in a network data processing system **(See the abstract of Jain et al. for reference to a method and apparatus for operating a digital communication network to avoid congestion)**. Jain et al. also discloses monitoring aggregate traffic for each of a plurality of network paths **(See column 9 lines 44-55 of Jain et al. for reference to**

Art Unit: 2665

monitoring the throughput associated with each source/destination pair sending packets). Jain et al. further discloses responsive to aggregate traffic for a selective network path exceeding a threshold, reducing the aggregate traffic for the selected network path **(See column 10 line 22 to column 11 line 39 of Jain et al. for reference to identifying S-D route pairs with throughputs which are larger than the fair share, which is a threshold, and decreasing the aggregate traffic of the violating S-D route pairs by decreasing a window size).**

With respect to claims 2, 8, 24, 30, 36, and 42, Jain et al. discloses that the traffic is measured using at least one of data transfer rate, peak data transfer rate, burst size, and maximum packet size **(See column 9 line 66 to column 10 line 31 of Jain et al. for reference to measuring throughput, which is the same as data transfer rate).**

With respect to claims 3, 9, 25, 31, 37, and 43, Jain et al. discloses reducing a congestion window **(See column 11 line 8-39 of Jain et al. for reference to reducing a window size).**

With respect to claims 4, 26, and 38, Jain et al. discloses reducing the congestion window using an equation $CW = \max(\text{MinW}, \min(CW * F, \text{MaxW}))$. Jain et al. discloses that a window size is reduced by a fraction of 0.875 times the current window size according to rules limiting a window size to a maximum and a minimum window size, which performs the same function as the claimed equation **(See column 11 lines 8-62 of Jain et al. for reference to the rules for reducing the window size).**

Art Unit: 2665

With respect to claims 5, 11, 27, 33, 39, and 45, Jain et al. discloses setting and changing a type of service for packets sent using the particular network path (See column 10 lines 22-31 of Jain et al. for reference to setting a congestion avoidance flag, which changes the type of service of the packet, for packets using on an S-D pair exceeding the fair share).

With respect to claims 12, 34, and 46, Jain et al. discloses that the threshold takes into account a fair share of bandwidth available for the plurality of network paths (See column 9 line 44 to column 10 line 31 of Jain et al. for reference to determining the fair share of bandwidth to be allocated to each S-D route pair and using the fair share as a congestion threshold).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 6, 28, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain et al. in view of Afek et al. (U.S. Pat. 5748901).

With respect to claims 6, 28, and 40, Jain et al. does not disclose dropping the packet.

With respect to claims 6, 28, and 40, Afek et al., in the field of communications discloses dropping a packet in accordance to a rate exceeding a threshold being detected for a particular path (**See column 11 lines 11-15 of Afek et al. for reference to dropping a packet if a rate exceeds a threshold**). Dropping a packet has the advantage of quickly reducing the congestion in a network path by not requiring already overused resources to process excess packets when congestion has been detected.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, when presented with the work of Afek et al., to combine dropping a packet, as suggested by Afek et al., with the congestion control system and method of Jain et al., with the motivation being to not require already overused resources to process excess packets when congestion has been detected.

6. Claims 10, 32, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain et al. in view of Blasbalg (U.S. Pat. 4771391).

With respect to claims 10, 32, and 44, Jain et al. does not disclose reducing a sending size for data packets.

With respect to claims 10, 32, and 44, Blasbalg, in the field of communications, discloses reducing the sending size of data packets when congestion is detected (**See column 12 line 53 to column 13 line 9 of Blasbalg for reference to reducing the packet size of packets on a congested path**). Reducing the sending size of packets has the advantage of providing a way of reducing congestion on a path while still allowing some traffic to pass on the path.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, when presented with the work of Blasbalg, to combine reducing the sending size of packets, as suggested by Blasbalg, with the congestion control system and method of Jain et al., with the motivation being to provide a way of reducing congestion on a path while still allowing some traffic to pass on the path.

7. Claims 13-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Packer et al. (U.S. Pat. 6205120) in view of Jain et al.

With respect to claims 13 and 18, Packer et al. discloses a data processing system (See column 4 lines 29-44 and Figure 1A of Packer et al. for reference to a client-server computer system, which is a data processing system). Packer et al. also discloses a bus system (See column 4 lines 45-59 and Figure 1A of Packer et al. for reference to bus subsystem 32). Packer et al. further discloses a communications unit connected to the bus (See column 4 lines 45-59 and Figure 1A of Packer et al. for reference to a network interface 40, which is a communications unit, connected to bus subsystem 32). Packer et al. also discloses a memory connected to the bus system (See column 4 lines 45-59 and Figure 1A of Packer et al. for reference to storage subsystem 35 connected to bus subsystem 32). Packer et al. further discloses a processor unit connected to the bus system (See column 4 lines 45-59 and Figure 1A of Packer et al. for reference to processor 30 connected to bus subsystem 32). Although the system of Packer et al. discloses implementing congestion control, Packer et al. does not specifically disclose

Art Unit: 2665

monitoring traffic for a plurality of network paths and reducing an amount of bandwidth available based on a fair share for the particular network path in response to a packet for a particular network path causing traffic to exceed a level of traffic allowed.

With respect to claims 13 and 18, Jain et al., in the field of communications, discloses monitoring traffic for a plurality of network paths (See column 9 lines 44-55 of Jain et al. for reference to monitoring the throughput associated with each source/destination pair sending packets). Jain et al. also discloses reducing an amount of bandwidth available based on a fair share for the particular network path in response to a packet for a particular network path causing traffic to exceed a level of traffic allowed (See column 10 line 22 to column 11 line 39 of Jain et al. for reference to identifying S-D route pairs with throughputs which are larger than the fair share and decreasing the bandwidth available to the violating S-D route pairs by decreasing a window size). Monitoring traffic for a plurality of network paths and reducing an amount of bandwidth available based on a fair share for the particular network path in response to a packet for a particular network path causing traffic to exceed a level of traffic allowed has the advantage of providing a congestion control method to stop overused data paths from flooding network resources.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, when presented with the work of Jain et al., to combine monitoring traffic for a plurality of network paths and reducing an amount of bandwidth available based on a fair share for the particular network path in response to a packet for a particular network path causing traffic to exceed a level of traffic allowed, as suggested by Jain et al., with

the data processing system of Packer et al., with the motivation being to provide a congestion control method to stop overused data paths from flooding network resources.

With respect to claims 14 and 19, Packer et al. discloses a primary bus and a secondary bus (See column 5 lines 1-8 of Packer et al. for reference to using multiple busses, which would include a primary bus and secondary busses).

With respect to claims 15 and 20, Packer et al. discloses using a single processor (See column 4 lines 45-59 and Figure 1A of Packer et al. for reference to using one or more processors 30).

With respect to claims 16 and 21, Packer et al. discloses that the processor unit includes a plurality of processors (See column 4 lines 45-59 and Figure 1A of Packer et al. for reference to using one or more processors 30).

With respect to claims 17 and 22, Packer et al. discloses that the communications unit is an Ethernet adapter (See column 4 lines 45-59 and Figure 1A of Packer et al. for reference to the network interface block 40 employing Ethernet).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason E Mattis whose telephone number is (571) 272-3154. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8AM-4:30PM.

Art Unit: 2665

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jem



HUY D. VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600